



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket No. SON-1659 *mg*

*AF/2673*  
*#8*  
*Recon*  
*1/25/02*

In re patent application of  
Takashi HIRAKAWA et al.

Serial No. 09/417,714

Group Art Unit: 2673

Filed: October 13, 1999

Examiner: L. Lao

Title: LIQUID-CRYSTAL DISPLAY APPARATUS AND THREE-PANEL LIQUID-  
CRYSTAL DISPLAY PROJECTOR

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

**RECEIVED**

**BOX AF**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

JAN 25 2002

Technology Center 2600

Sir:

**REMARKS**

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action dated November 27, 2001.

Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable, and this application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants note that all rejections are identical to the rejections set forth in the first Office Action of July 5, 2001. Accordingly, Applicants repeat the previous response below, supplemented with additional comments in response to the examiner's conclusion given in the Office Action at page 4, paragraph 6. In paragraph 6, the examiner alleges that Muraji et al. '797 teaches an apparatus for canceling chrominance non-uniformity by superimposing a correction signal to a primary color, and further alleges that this signal is the same as Applicants' correction signal. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The signal disclosed, taught and suggested in Muraji et al. '797, Song '709 and Imai '128 correct only for LUMINANCE, discussed below. The examiner is ignoring the fact that a chrominance non-uniformity correction circuit 21 is shown in Applicants Fig. 2, and that a chrominance non-uniformity correction signal is input to the electrical signal processing system 20. This is most evident by the fact that the examiner avoids